

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed June 28, 2007, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration. Claims 1-42 were previously pending in this application. By this amendment, claims 1, 14, 21, 34, 41 and 42 have been amended. Claims 1-42 are pending for examination with claims 1, 14, 21, 34, 41, and 42 being independent claims. No new matter has been added.

Amendments to the Claims

Applicants request that the amendments be entered to expedite prosecution of this application. Applicants respectfully assert that the Examiner has rejected the claims based on an unreasonable interpretation of the reference and the claims. These amendments emphasize the reasons that the claims distinguish over the references of record. However, the amendments do not materially alter the scope of the claims and therefore do not raise new issues.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Nyman et al, U.S. Published Patent Application No. 2003/0037033. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's interpretation of the Nyman reference and therefore respectfully assert that the reference does not anticipate the claims.

Briefly, Applicants summarized the specification of the present application and the Nyman reference in the Amendment filed March 23, 2007. In that Amendment, Applicants also specifically identified limitations of the claims that are not met by the reference. Rather than repeat the same arguments, Applicants focus their comments on paragraphs 25-28 of the Office Action in which the Examiner responds to the Amendment.

In paragraph 25, the Examiner asserts that Nyman discloses "displaying a name conflict indicator on a graphic user interface." In support of this position, the Examiner points to the "conflict flag" in the "name manager table" described in the reference. However, the reference contains no indication that the name manager table is ever displayed on a graphic user interface. To the contrary, the reference indicates that the name manager table contains information used

by the device to control the appearance of a name when displayed. For example, FIG. 2B illustrates that font information is stored in connection with each of the names in the name manager table. The device does not display that font information. Rather, the device uses the font information to select a font when a name is displayed. Similarly, color, animation and sound information contained in the name manager table is not displayed on a graphic user interface, but is used to control the display when a name is on the display. The point is further emphasized by the "Okay to display" information contained in the name manager table of FIG. 2B. The "Okay to display" information is not presented in conjunction with the name but is used to determine whether the name should be displayed at all (See paragraph 0093).

The conflict flag 231, like other information in the name manager table, is not displayed on the graphic user interface. As stated in paragraph 105, "the name conflict flag in field 231 of the name record...would store an index value identifying which of the plurality of alternate names was chosen for the device." Therefore, the conflict flag cannot act as a conflict indicator as claimed.

In paragraph 26, the Examiner asserts that the naming menu (80) of Nyman receives user input specifying an alternative display name. However, naming menu 80 allows a user to input multiple names for its own device (See paragraph 78). In contrast, the present application describes a user selecting alternate names for contacts with which that user wishes to communicate.

In paragraph 27, the Examiner asserts that Nyman discloses receiving through a graphic user interface an indication of a selected contact and obtaining the authentication and certification level of the selected contact. The Examiner points to passages in Nyman that describe public keys. However, in Nyman public keys are used to control whether a device displays a user name. Once the user name is displayed, there would be no further reason in the system of Nyman to access the public key information and Nyman does not describe any function corresponding to obtaining the authentication and certification level of a contact that has been selected through a graphic user interface.

In paragraph 28, the Examiner asserts that not providing information to a user is the same as "warning the user." Applicants respectfully assert that the Examiner's interpretation of the term "warning" is not reasonable. In the context of Nyman, a user name may not appear on a second user's display for any of a number of reasons. One reason could be that the user

transmitted a name distribution message encrypted with a key the device does not have. However, a name may not appear because the device never transmitted a name distribution message or because there is no such device. Accordingly, there is no basis to conclude from Nyman that a user observing a display that is not displaying a name would be warned.

Further, there is no reasonable interpretation of the claim and Nyman under which lack of display of a name as a warning would meet all other limitations of the claims. All of the claims that recite a “warning” also recite a “selected contact.” If no name is displayed, then the name cannot be selected and the contact cannot be a “selected contact” in a way that meets all other limitations of the claims.

Nonetheless, to expedite prosecution, Applicants have amended the claims. These amendments are not intended to alter the scope of the claims, but are intended to emphasize that the Examiner’s interpretation of the reference is not reasonable. For example, claims 1, 21 and 41 are amended to make clear that the selection of an alternative display name allows creating a second graphic user interface that provides a function relating to controlling communication with another device. This changes makes clear that the claims are directed to a very different function than allowing a user to enter an alternative name for him or herself.

Claims 14, 34 and 42 have also been amended to make clear that the term “warning” is used according to its ordinary meaning and involves presenting information to a user.

Additionally, each of the claims contains multiple limitations not shown or suggested in the reference. For example, claim 1 recites “displaying a name conflict indicator next to a first display name.” As pointed out above, the conflict flag in Nyman is not displayed and the reference does not meet this limitation claim. Additionally, the reference can not meet other limitations that relate to the name conflict indicator. For example, claim 1 also recites action “in response to user input associated with the name conflict indicator.”

Further, as pointed out in response to the previous Office Action, Nyman relates to a system that automatically chooses an alternative display name. Accordingly, there is no portion of the reference that meets limitations such as “receiving user input selecting an alternative display name...the alternative display name being selected from the plurality of equivalent display names” that are displayed in response to user input.

For reasons that should be apparent from the foregoing, Nyman does also not teach or suggest multiple limitations of claims 21 and 41. For example, the reference does not describe a

“means for displaying on a first user interface of a device, a name conflict indicator.” Similarly, there is no “means responsive to user input associated with the name conflict indicator.” Further, there is no “means for receiving user input selecting an alternative display name” that allows the alternative display name to be selected from a plurality of equivalent display names displayed in response to user input. Likewise there is no means for identifying a selected identity with an alternative display name on a “second graphic user interface providing a function relating to controlling communication...between the device and second device associated with the selected identity.”

Nyman also does not teach or suggest multiple limitations of independent claim 14. As pointed out above, Nyman does not meet the limitation of “obtaining the authentication and certification level of the selected contact.” In the context of the claim, the selected contact is indicated by user input received through a graphic user interface. Also, Nyman does not meet the limitation that requires “presenting information constituting a warning to the user.”

For reasons that should be apparent from the foregoing, each of claims 34 and 42 recite limitations not shown in Nyman. For example, the references does not teach or suggest “means for obtaining the authentication and certification level of the selected contact.” In the context of the claim, the selected contact is indicated through a graphic user interface. Likewise, the references provides no “mechanism that presents information constituting a warning to the user.” As to claim 42, multiple limitations also are not met by the reference. For example, there is no “program code for obtaining the authentication and certification level of the selected contact.” In the context of the claim, the selected contact is indicated through a graphic user interface. Further, the Nyman reference does not teach or suggest “program code for presenting information constituting a warning to the user.”

Accordingly, each of the independent claims contains multiple limitations not shown or suggested in the Nyman reference. The remaining claims depend, directly or indirectly, from one of the independent claims and should be allowed for at least the same reasons. The dependent claims recite limitations that further distinguish the reference.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at the telephone number listed below if this communication does not place the case in condition for allowance.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicant hereby requests any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, that is not covered by an enclosed check, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 23/2825.

Dated: August 28, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Edmund J. Walsh
Registration No. 32,950
Wolf, Greenfield & Sacks, P.C.
600 Atlantic Avenue
Boston, Massachusetts 02210-2206
Telephone: (617) 646-8000